DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 454 EA 026 069

AUTHOR Howe, William
TITLE Beyond Garbage Cans: An Analysis of Theory and Research in Educational Leadership and Recommendations for the Future.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 57p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cross Cultural Studies; *Educational Administration; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Leadership; *Management Development; School Administration; Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

This article presents a survey of the state-of-the-art in leadership theory and research in educational administration. First, it reviews major issues in educational leadership: defining the concept, building a knowledge base, choosing methodologies and analytical approachers, and training educational leaders. Second, it treats theory in educational leadership by focusing on general considerations, by surveying recent studies of educational leadership (1980-91), and by discussing some important recent international perspectives. Third, it treats research in educational leadership by again looking at general considerations, by surveying the same recent studies of educational leadership, and by outlining some important recent international research initiatives. Fourth, it lists emergent trends in educational leadership research. Finally, it presents possible directions for future research. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 373 454

BEYOND GARBAGE CANS: AN ANALYSIS OF THEORY AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

William Howe
Jepson School of Leadership Studies
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173
(804) 287-6086

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Howe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 026 069

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 1994.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This article presents a survey of the state-of-the-art in leadership theory and research in educational administration. First, it reviews majors issues in educational leadership: defining the concept, building a knowledge base, choosing methodologies and analytical approaches, and training educational leaders. Second, it treats theory in educational leadership by focusing on general considerations, by surveying recent studies of educational leadership (1980-1991), and by discussing some important recent international perspectives. Third, it treats research in educational leadership by again looking at general considerations, by surveying the same recent studies of educational leadership, and by outlining some important recent international research initiatives. Fourth, it lists emergent trends in educational leadership research. Finally, it presents possible directions for future research. Key words: leadership, administration, management.

Leadership in Educational Administration: Theory and Research

This article discusses leadership in educational administration by focusing on both theory and research. It primarily treats theory and research since 1980, borrowing Bridges' (1982) model for a systematic survey of studies but also including some consideration of non-empirical materials, periodical indices, and professional association programs. Though leadership in educational administration -- much like the field of educational administration itself -- is often assessed as an inchoate, amorphous domain composed of unsynthesizable bits and pieces (see Walker 1989, Morris 1985, Crehan 1985), the article seeks to provide a meta-view that includes, rather than excludes or reduces, the differences and the messiness within the domain. For this reason, it does not exclude recent considerations of teachers and students as leaders, though such groups are usually not considered within the ranks of administration. Moreover, it includes theoretical and research perspectives from several different countries. On the other hand, it suggests that educational leadership is <u>not</u> synonymous with educational administration or with educational management; thus, it excludes much of the research that indiscriminately or haphazardly conflates "leadership," "administration," and "management." Finally, it discusses some emerging trends in the study of educational leadership and offers some directions for future research.

<u>1. Introduction</u>

The study of leadership has been a prominent sub-field of educational administration since the 1950s. Indeed, between then and 1982, about 20% of the studies that looked at school administrators used leadership as a focus of inquiry (Bridges 1982). Furthermore, between 1980 and 1992, the interest in educational leadership has increased substantially. In Education Index, the list of "leadership" items nearly doubled from 1980-81 to 1990-91; in Research in Education, "leadership" items increased over 50% from 1980 to 1990, with much of that increase occurring after 1986 and thus coinciding with the "second wave" of educational reform; in Dissertation Abstracts International, the number of items listed for "instructional leadership" increased 100% from 1980-84 to 1985-89; and at American Educational Research Association (AERA) annual meetings, sessions that included leadership as a focus more than tripled between the early 1980s and the early 1990s, while papers/presentations increased more than five-fold. Some scholars have gone so far as to call reform of educational leadership the "third wave" in the reform movement that began in the early 1980s.

Though much of this increased interest is expressed through opinion pieces and prescriptions, there is, nevertheless, a rapidly growing body of empirical research on leadership which -- despite its often fragmentary, repetitious, disparate, and even useless nature (see Immegart 1988, Bridges 1982, Morris 1985) -- deserves careful consideration. Immegart (1988), whose mapping of the expansive territory of leadership research and its relation to educational leadership should be a point of departure for

anyone interested in the subject, argues that "concern about educational leadership ought to be a matter of greater import to researchers and the profession at large" (1988 p. 275). Surprisingly enough, he claims that "educational studies of leadership and research on educational leaders appear to be dwindling in number, not increasing" (1988 p. 267), a position that may reflect a more restricted definition of leadership than that used here.

However one conceives leadership, it is clear that it has been and still is a domain of significant concern in educational administration and that, though educational leadership theory and research have emerged predominantly in the United States, England, Canada, and Australia, there is important research emerging from Israel, Lebanon, and other countries, as well as some recent research which presents international comparisons of educational leadership in the Middle East, Africa, and the Orient.

2. Major Issues in Educational Leadership

Though numerous issues have surfaced within studies of educational leadership, four broad but important issues are discussed here: defining/describing the concept of leadership, building a knowledge base, choosing methodologies and analytical approaches, and training educational leaders.

2.1 Defining/Describing the Concept of Leadership

"Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Burns 1978) and one of the most heavily researched areas within the social sciences (Bass 1991). Hundreds

of different and often incompatible definitions of leadership have been presented in the social science and organizational literatures during the twentieth century (Rost 1990), with no single definition, nor even any of the usual litany of theoretical approaches -- "great man" theory, trait theory, behavioral theory, contingency theory, situational theory, transformational theory -- assuming a preeminent position. The study of leadership has been fraught with contradictions, conflicting results, endless repetition, seemingly irreconcilable disciplinary perspectives, and, perhaps most importantly, an inability to agree upon a definition or a general description of the phenomenon.

The conceptual confusion within the general area of leadership studies is compounded, for educators, by several factors:

(a) There is no agreement as to what <u>educational administration</u> is, how it is similar to or different from <u>administration</u> in general, whether <u>educational leadership</u> is a sub-set of <u>educational administration</u> (Mintzberg 1973) or whether the two are essentially the same (Hodgkinson 1991), or whether or not <u>leadership</u>, <u>administration</u>, and <u>management</u> are conceptually distinct terms. For the most part, scholars in educational administration use <u>leadership</u>, <u>administration</u>, and <u>management</u> indiscriminately and accept these terms unquestioningly as institutionalized synonyms. Moreover, while some scholars do attempt to distinguish the terms and to define "leadership" precisely (see Greenfield et al. 1986), others argue, for

example, that "'leadership' is a vague term encompassing both administration and management" and that "leadership is administration" (Hodgkinson 1991).

The titles and structures used by departments of educational administration both borrow from and exacerbate the conceptual confusion. Some departments, for example, use "Dept. of Educational Administration," while others use "Dept. of Educational Leadership," "Department of Administration and Educational Leadership," or "Department of Administrative Leadership. In a study of 58 of the 68 departments affiliated with the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) in the United States (Norton 1988), 41 departments used some variant of "administration" in their titles, 7 used "leadership," and 3 used both. Surprisingly, leadership courses comprise only 3% of course work in UCEA schools (Norton and Levan 1988), suggesting perhaps that leadership is valued in terms of image and marketing but devalued in the curricula.

(b) Whether considering leadership, administration, or both, scholars are at odds as to whether they should support conceptual unity and a synthesis of ideas, on the one hand, or conceptual pluralism and a multiplicity of ideas, on the other. Some argue, for example, that studies of educational leadership should seek a synthesis of the various definitions and concepts at this point because the domain has become unwieldy, fragmented,

highly specialized, and amorphous; they tend to press for broad surveys that can sort through and reassemble the fragments or for meta-analyses that can combine various studies and deliver a more comprehensive understanding of leadership. Others support conceptual diversity because it reduces parochialism, spurs imaginative thinking, and leads to stimulating exchanges of ideas; they tend to encourage further diversity. Still others straddle the fence, calling for synthesis while at the same time supporting conceptual pluralism (see Immegart 1988, Crehan 1985).

(c) Educational leadership can be examined on several different levels -- school (secondary or elementary), district, state or province, nation. Furthermore, there are leaders -- principals, superintendents, department heads, teachers -- and also "leaders of leaders," including "philosophers, theoreticians, academics, and government officials" (Morris 1985). In addition, leadership may be exercised by collectives as well as by individuals -- e.g., by a department within a school, by a school within a district, or by ancillary institutions such as professional societies, private foundations, or various educational agencies. Finally, too, there may be complex leadership alliances or networks between individuals, between collectives, or between individuals and collectives.

traditional notion of leadership as an independent variable is based on a deficient conception of what leaders do.

(e) The emphasis in recent decades on issues like equity, democratization, empowerment, and participative decision making in connection with leadership has clouded the traditional notion of the leader as an individual. Is leadership an individual or a group phenomenon, or both? Is it dispersed among many or concentrated in a few?

(f) There is a conflict between those who believe that leadership is an externally observable and measurable phenomenon and those who believe that it exists within the minds of those who experience it or perceive it (see 3.1 below).

Leadership has been identified as an important factor in education by research on effective schools, on change, on school improvement, and on implementation (Clark et al. 1984). Despite its apparent importance, however, researchers are often frustrated by the conceptual confusion surrounding it. It has been called an "enigma" that is "deeply colored by the culture in which it occurs" (Walker 1989 p. 13); a concern that becomes less clear the more scholarship seeks to clarify it (Duke 1986); a broken Humpty Dumpty among whose shards scholars scavenge for pieces (Hodgkinson 1981); a concept "not so much vacuous as protean, impenetrable, elusive and delusive (Hodgkinson 1991 p. 49); and a domain in which no one can possibly become an expert (Immegart 1988).

Immegart argues that conceptualizations of leadership "tend not to approach the full picture or range of even the known

dimensions" (1988 p. 272) and calls for more rigorous, expansive formulations that consider the concept in all its complexity. Similarly, Duke suggests that leadership is a "gestalt phenomenon, greater than the sum of its behavioral parts" and that we are unlikely to understand it "as long as we try to construct boundaries around it" (1986 p. 10). Clearly, researchers in educational administration have not agreed upon any single way of defining or describing leadership and often argue that it must be defined in broader terms or that it resists definition and should not be defined at all. Morris (1985) even suggests that the concept may be more problematic in education than in any other area.

Nevertheless, many of those researchers would agree with most or all of the following propositions: (a) leadership is not coercion or obtaining compliance to decisions, rules, regulations, or policies by means of coercion; (b) leadership involves an influence relationship between leader(s) and followers with the intent of realizing change, accomplishing mutual purposes, or creating shared meaning; (c) leadership involves interaction with people rather than, or at least in addition to, engaging in technical aspects of work; (d) leadership is shaped by personal, organizational, and environmental factors and their interaction, and results in various outcomes, with improvement of the 'technical core' -- curriculum, instruction, and learning -- being the most important outcome; (e) leadership involves values, culture, and moral/ethical concerns, as well as needs, wants, and aspirations;

(f) leadership involves internal feelings and experiences, as well as external actions and behaviors.

Given the confusion surrounding leadership, it is remarkable that the concept endures and continues to capture the interest of the educational research community. "After all the debate, all the theorizing, all the research, we are left with a phenomenon which in its complexity remains almost as amorphous, as subtle and fragile as ever and yet in its ubiquity and significance is as pressing as it was when Moses set out to lead his people to a promised land...." (Walker 1989 p. 17).

1.2 Building a Knowledge Base

Though few researchers directly discuss the issue of a knowledge base for the study of leadership in educational administration, that issue is implicit in much of the literature, particularly in the persistent lament about conceptual confusion, increasing specialization, needless repetition, and fragmentation. Several scholars point to the need for a synthesis of what is known but at the same time acknowledge the difficulty of undertaking meta-analysis with any success or of summarizing the volume of the literature (Immegart 1988; Crehan 1985; Boyan 1988). Some note various factors that hamper the development of a knowledge base:

(a) Educational leadership researchers often work with additional and different disciplinary perspectives (psychological, sociological, anthropological, economic, philosophical, etc.), making any collation or synthesis of the breadth of studies difficult for those who employ specific

disciplinary lenses.

(b) Leadership research -- in general and in education -- makes use of a variety of methodological and analytical approaches, from a positivist paradigm (traditional (phenomenology, hermeneutics) and these approaches resist attempts to synthesize or combine them.

(c) Researchers may operate from apparently irreconcilable theoretical or conceptual perspectives -- e.g., leadership is observable behavior vs. leadership is internalized experience.

(d) Much of the research merely looks at one small piece of educational leadership or, as Immegart (1988) suggests, clutters the broad picture with conceptual or methodological deficiencies. Many of the dissertations on educational leadership (and these constitute much of the research) exhibit these characteristics. Also, much of the research has neither a theoretical/conceptual framework nor a problem orientation (see Bridges 1982).

(e) The preponderance of the writing on educational leadership is descriptive and/or prescriptive, almost as though the subject itself attracts those who want to express their opinion on what leadership is or how it should be done. This writing tends to mask and obfuscate legitimate research, and at times it misinterprets and misrepresents that research.

(f) Many researchers who write about educational leadership display little knowledge of the broader field of

leadership studies. Research on educational leadership, in fact, may lag behind or simply mirror leadership research in other disciplines (see Immegart 1988), making it difficult for those within educational administration to understand and employ recent advances in the knowledge of leadership. The obverse of that is equally true: Few scholars in the field of leadership studies pay much attention to research in education (Rost 1991 is a notable exception), though that research has much to contribute to the field.

(g) Few studies of educational leadership take a longitudinal perspective or a multicultural perspective, and few focus on leadership in different settings or situations.

(h) The bias during and for some time after the "theory movement" toward scientific inquiry in educational leadership research may have limited the possibilities researchers have explored and inhibited advances in what is known (see Immegart 1988).

(i) Researchers often seem more interested in breaking new ground than in collating or synthesizing knowledge about educational leadership (Immegart 1988). The penchant for originality, especially in a domain subject to much confusion and always alert for a means of transcending the hubbub, may be particularly strong among those who examine leadership or educational leadership.

Though Immegart looks beyond education and educational administration to leadership in general, his review raises

pertinent questions about a knowledge base for leadership in educational administration. He attempts, for example, to present a "review of reviews" which outlines "findings that have stood the test of time," "the accumulation of knowledge," "what is known ... with some certainty," "reasonably well-agreed upon or established outcomes," and the "weight of evidence"; but he is compelled to admit that his "broad, holistic perspective" is only "a starting point for understanding leadership inquiry, not a source of all the knowledge from or about it" (1988 p. 260). Furthermore, he argues that "the accumulation of empirical data has not produced an integrated understanding of leadership," though he does suggest that "there has been both an accumulation of knowledge and a progression of investigations that have built upon prior empirical activity and findings...." (1988 p. 266). Thus, he seems to imply that there <u>is</u> and <u>is not</u> a knowledge base, or, put another way, that there is no firm foundation in leadership research but rather a continual building process without any single or unified foundation. Indeed, he suggests that instead of developing a knowledge base, leadership research has continually evolved toward a general understanding that the subject is extraordinarily complex and that leadership is related to multiple variables -- an evolution, one might say, away from the possibility of a commonly accepted knowledge base.

Two other points deserve note:

(1) Knowledge accumulation/generalization in leadership research, whether related to education or not, may be detrimental because it tends to focus attention upon "averages" in

leadership and to eliminate potentially valuable variations and exceptions from the "best way to lead" (see Immegart 1988 p. 272). In that sense, leadership research -- if it concentrates on central tendencies and on common findings -- may move closer to an agreed-upon knowledge base but sacrifice fertility and new directions in the process.

(2) Though rarely, if ever, employed in leadership studies, some poststructuralist perspectives -- i.e., deconstruction, semiology -- would suggest that "knowledge base" implies an origin or foundation that is undone by the very textuality of the research itself. From those perspectives, the "base" of educational leadership research is texts, themselves always interpretations of (or responses to) other texts and so on ad infinitum, and all research can provide is interpretation, not a simple "base" or linear building of knowledge.

2.3 Choosing Methodologies and Analytical Approaches

From the 1950s through the 1970s, research on educational leadership grew primarily out of the structural-functional paradigm that dominated social science inquiry, with the scientific-positivistic orientation of the "theory movement" driving most studies and compelling use of some variant of the hypothetico-deductive method. The legacy of the "theory movement" and associated methodologies is still evident in much educational leadership research today, as it is in most educational

administration research in general. Nevertheless, methodological and analytical approaches deriving from the naturalistic or interpretive paradigm, and influenced by several different disciplinary perspectives, emerged during the 1980s to broaden the scope of educational leadership research and the choices researchers have to pursue that research. There is now a wide range of methodological and analytical possibilities available, and educational leadership researchers are faced with deciding which possibilities are most appropriate for the questions or problems they wish to address. Such decisions may involve consideration of various conceptual perspectives, study designs, data sources, data collection strategies, variables and patterns of variable interaction, and analytical procedures (see 3 and 4 below).

Careful selection of methodological and analytical approaches is ever more crucial (and also ever more difficult) now that there are various possibilities from which to choose. Leadership research today -- and this is particularly true for education -- can no longer abide studies with raw empiricism, studies where predetermined variables dictate a conceptual framework, studies involving simple correlation analysis of a limited number of variables (a large percentage of dissertations on educational leadership), studies that rely on overused and often outdated questionnaires or on reputational approaches, or studies that rely on the most convenient samples or methods. Furthermore, leadership research today should attempt to make use of different approaches together, triangulating various strategies to increase

the validity of results. "The role of the methodologist in leadership study is increasing, and a high level of analytical expertise will be required in future studies" (Immegart 1988 p. 271), particularly since researchers may have to move from one paradigm to another and across a number of disciplines.

2.4 Training Educational Leaders

Training educational leaders has been a major issue in the literature and at professional meetings. Articles listed under "leadership training" comprise 12% of all leadership articles in Education Index between 1980 and 1991 and 27% of all leadership articles in Research in Education between 1980 and 1990. AERA annual meeting programs list at least 10 identifiable sessions on leadership training/development between 1980 and 1991.

There is meager evidence about the effectiveness of leadership training in general. In addition, most of the research in this area is weak in design and execution, most of the leadership models implemented in training programs remain untested, and most training techniques -- i.e., lectures, films, simulations, exercises -- have not been adequately assessed for on-the-job effects. Thus, "it is difficult to determine the value of leadership training from the available evidence, and one should be extremely cautious of the claims (and the empirical work) in this regard" (Immegart 1988 p. 268).

The literature on leadership training in educational administration suggests that the training has often overestimated the influence educational leaders have in school settings (see Bridges 1977), that most training programs emphasize managerial,

clerical responsibilities rather than leadership competencies (Norton and Levan 1988, Murphy 1992), and that training is usually based on a bureaucratic, scientific model of education (leaders as heads of "centers of production") stemming from the industrial revolution and out of step with the information age (leaders as facilitators of "communities of learners") (Murphy 1992). Furthermore, the literature emphasizes aspects of training that have not been adequately addressed but that have become increasingly important concerns of practicing educational leaders: (a) understanding and acting on racial and social inequities; (b) educating non-native students and working with multicultural student populations; (c) dealing with societal problems which students bring with them into schools -- substance abuse, poverty, illiteracy, physical and emotional abuse, single-parent families, etc.; (d) envisioning and implementing instructional programs and curricula that emphasize thinking skills, problem framing, and multiple learning styles; (e) integrating with, and networking with, other social service agencies; (f) dealing with public demands and public scrutiny; (g) motivating students to stay in school (see Murphy 1992 on a-g); (h) establishing and acting on morally meaningful, purposive values and beliefs (Sergiovanni 1992, Hodgkinson 1991, Greenfield 1988); (i) understanding, applying, and integrating knowledge from multiple content areas within the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts (Murphy 1992, Hodgkinson 1991); (j) focusing on real people, real situations, and real problems rather than on general budgeting, finance, or legal issues

(Murphy 1992, Bridges 1992). Above all else, the literature indicates that training programs should conceive educational leadership as primarily leadership of the 'technical core' -- that is, leadership that promotes active student learning through meaningful, personalized, student-centered instruction and curricula (Murphy 1992) -- and that programs should operationalize training concepts by using practice-oriented strategies.

Unfortunately, few empirical studies of educational leadership discuss the implications of findings for training programs; most make brief mention of training, as though it merited only a brief afterthought. But new and well-conceived training programs are emerging both in and outside of university contexts. Stanford University's new program, based upon a problem-based learning model developed and tested in medical schools, emphasizes small-group learning and grappling with the actual problems educational leaders face on the job (Bridges 1992). The National Association of Principals' Centers, based at Harvard University, offers many possibilities for leadership networks and for the ongoing training of leaders. Peer-Assisted Leadership, a program developed at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and designed to provide collegial professional development for school leaders, has now been introduced in the United States, Canada, and the Netherlands. Still, assessment of these and other programs, as well as of various training methods, remains in its infancy.

3. Theory

The discussion here treats three concerns: general considerations about the use of theory in studies of educational leadership; the use of leadership theory in the educational administration literature, 1980-1991; and international perspectives on, and use of, theory in the domain of educational leadership since 1980.

3.1 General Considerations

The evolution of the role of theory in educational administration, from the "theory movement" of the 1950s to the ambiguous and contentious nature of theory in the 1990s, reflects a similar evolution in the role of theory in educational leadership. Today, the use of theory in educational leadership research all too frequently harkens back to positivistic, scientific roots in the "theory movement" -- i.e., to use of Halpin's (1966) theory of initiating structure and consideration (two behavioral dimensions of leadership, the former broadly referring to the establishment of work patterns and procedures and the latter to behavior that indicates friendliness and warmth in leader-follower relations) and the related instrument, Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ); or to Fiedler's Contingency Theory (leadership is contingent upon the fit between the kind of motivation -- task-oriented or relationship-oriented -- which the leader uses and the 'favorableness' of the situation) and the related instrument, the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC).

Nevertheless, there are several new directions emerging in the

discussion of theory for studies of educational leadership: (a) a call for inductive, naturalistic theories or for the development of "grounded theory" based upon "thick description" of real leaders in real settings; (b) incorporation of factors external to schools -- i.e., of what has become known loosely as "open systems theory" -- and of the leader-environment relationship; (c) doubts, frustrations, and disenchantment with theory itself and a consequent turn to problem-oriented research, to bits and pieces of theories, to informal and less constrained use of theory, or to atheoretical research; (d) use of theoretical perspectives from both the social sciences and the humanities and also from several disciplines, including philosophy, literature, aesthetics, drama, and history, as well as anthropology, psychology, sociology, and management science; (e) inclusion of some perspectives from feminist theories and gender theories; (f) a general reluctance to look for a grand universal theory of educational leadership and an acceptance of the fact that leadership is contextual or situational; (g) use of theoretical perspectives that seem more practical and more relevant to diverse educational contexts than the older, positivistic theories; (h) a focus on theoretical perspectives that treat language, values, beliefs, moral/ethical issues, culture, meaning, and the individual or social construction/interpretation of reality; (i) inclusion of multiple kinds of leaders, including teachers, and of shared leadership, participative decision making, the just use of power, and reflective self-criticism.

Some educational leadership scholars seem to value theory; others argue that the pursuit of theory is a waste of time or that theory reduces essential complexity, conflict, and uncertainty. A few still seem to advocate the use of a single theory that would synthesize many of the loose strands; others want multiple theoretical perspectives or no theory at all and sometimes argue that the idea of theory itself is wrought up with the presuppositions of a structural-functional paradigm or with disguised ideological positions. Some argue for objective theories of leadership behavior, others for subjective theories of leadership experience. There is, thus, little consensus about the status or use of theory in educational leadership research, though the subject itself seems to raise researchers' hackles and to introduce unending ferment with both petty squabbles and fertile debate.

A few general conclusions about theory in the recent educational leadership literature bear note:

(a) The discussion or use of theory often exhibits little knowledge of leadership theory in the field of leadership studies. There are, for example, few studies of educational leadership that make use of transformational theory (Burns 1978), charismatic theory (see Bass 1990), attribution theory (Pfeffer 1978), of other leadership theories.

(b) There is a growing concern about practical and ethical issues in the theories or the loose theoretical perspectives. At times, in fact, <u>theory</u> seems to give way

to what might be called general practical insight. At other times, "theory" gives way to the more practice-oriented and less explanation-oriented term "metaphor."

(c) Despite widespread recognition that schools are open systems, many studies still employ theoretical perspectives that treat schools as closed systems and leaders as individuals who are unaffected by external factors.

(d) There has been little concern with cumulative theory development/growth and little concrete dialogue between researchers about the merits or demerits of a theory or theoretical perspective. Furthermore, many studies admit that results may not be generalizable, thus inhibiting the possibility that the theory or theoretical perspective employed can be extended or applied to different situations.

(e) There is serious debate about what paradigm(s) most adequately help frame theories that are relevant to educational leadership -- structural-functional, interpretive, or radical humanist. Nevertheless, theories or theoretical perspectives from the interpretive paradigm have mounted a strong challenge to those from the traditional structural-functional paradigm, if only within the non-empirical debates. Those who propose these alternative theories or theoretical perspectives often argue that the purpose of theory is to interpret the

meaning of leadership, not to explain it, predict it, or master it.

(f) Practicing educational leaders are rarely acquainted with, and rarely make conscious use of, any leadership theory.

(g) Much of the research on educational leadership is atheoretical or without any coherent theoretical perspective. Moreover, when the research does claim to be based upon a theory or theoretical perspective, the theory is often poorly articulated, inadequately operationalized, and at least partially untested. In addition, when theories and theoretical perspectives are used in the domain of educational leadership, they are often an amalgamation of theories, outcomes, opinions, and whatever fits the variables employed. Sometimes, too, theory and methodology seem to merge so that the two are indistinguishable.

(h) Most theories discussed or used in the educational leadership literature stem from theories or bits of theories developed in other disciplines rather than in education itself. Even when theories are borrowed, however, they are often invoked in a superficial fashion, especially in the recent popular use of loose coupling, garbage can, or institutional theories, which were initially developed as much from a consideration of schools as organizations as from a consideration of educational leadership.

(i) There are some attempts, though few, to offer radical reconceptualizations of educational leadership (see Hodgkinson 1991 on "value theory," Smith and Blase 1991 on hermeneutics, Duke 1986 on aesthetic theory).

(j) The research is increasingly in agreement that there is no one best way to lead, and, therefore, that there is no best theory for educational leadership, not even a contingency theory which, though open to multiple contingencies, is still linked to a positivistic notion of theory (but see Sara 1981 for an argument that suggests the possibility of a "universal theory").

3.2 Recent Studies: 1980-1991

A thorough review of issues of Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ), Journal of Educational Administration (JEA), and Administrator's Notebook (AN) for the years 1980-1991 revealed that there are 64 articles that focus solely on leadership, partly on leadership, or use "leadership" and "administration" indistinguishably and therefore merit consideration in a discussion of the subject of educational leadership. Of those 64, 36 (56%) are empirical studies; those represent, within the periodical literature, the state-of-the-art in research on leadership in educational administration.

Of the 36 empirical studies, only 9 have a clear theoretical orientation, while the other 27 have a problem orientation or have neither a theoretical nor a clearly identifiable problem orientation and are simply descriptive or correlational in nature. Thus, only 25% have a theoretical orientation, supporting

the frequent claim that most of the research on leadership in educational administration is atheoretical. Interestingly, only 2 of the 9 theoretically-oriented articles come from EAQ (17% of that journal's empirical studies of leadership), while the other 7 come from JEA (35% of that journal's empirical studies of leadership), suggesting that JEA's more international focus and the use of theory in educational leadership may be linked.

The theoretically-oriented articles tend to look back to the "theory movement": three employ Halpin's theory of initiating structure and consideration; one makes use of Fiedler's Contingency Theory; one borrows the theory of authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles that originated in the Ohio and Michigan studies of leadership in the 1960s; one combines the theory of initiating structure and consideration with the theory of subordinates' zone of acceptance, the latter deriving from the work of Barnard and Simon on the range of behavior of leaders within which subordinates will accept decisions; and one uses Argyris and Schon's notion of espoused theory vs. theory-in-use to frame a "theory of professional practice." The other two attempt to chart some largely unexplored territory in research on educational leadership: Both make use of Kerr's theory of substitutes for leadership, a recently developed theory in leadership studies which claims that values, norms, and beliefs can serve as substitutes for a leader (see Bass 1990 p. 683).

Among the articles that have a problem orientation or are simply descriptive or correlational, more than a third focus on

the subject of instructional leadership. Others look at how decentralization affects leaders, how leaders allocate their time, how teacher leaders perform, how female leaders understand their careers, how leaders are prepared, how leadership training is assessed, how leaders understand leader succession, how leader behavior differs across cultures, how regulations and constraints affect leaders, how leaders facilitate change, and how leaders are effective or ineffective.

Clearly, most discussion of leadership theory occurs in non-empirical articles and books. Those who write about theory in educational leadership are eager to debate it and to offer opinions on it and prescriptions for it; far less often do they actually use it, as if the polemics about leadership theories, stemming from the grander paradigm-level polemics, are more interesting to scholars than the application of those theories. Moreover, much of the discussion focuses on the concept of leadership rather than on the broader notion of theory, as if scholars want to grasp what leadership means before they develop and apply theories about it. Nonetheless, there is a growing body of non-empirical literature about theories of educational leadership or the status of theory in educational leadership that coincides with the non-empirical literature about theories of educational administration; and both literatures partake of the general paradigm-level debates about positivistic vs. naturalistic theories, hypothetico-deductive theory vs. phenomenological/hermeneutical theory, observed reality vs.

interpreted reality (see Sergiovanni 1992, Duke 1986, Smith and Blase 1991, Greenfield 1984, Foster 1986).

3.3 International Perspectives

The "theory movement" has had a lasting impact upon educational leadership research in the United States. However, since that movement originated in the United States and only later emerged in other countries, it has had far less impact outside the Unitred States. Furthermore, educational leadership scholars in Commonwealth countries -- England, Australia, Canada, New Zealand -- have often resisted scientific, positivistic theoretical perspectives and have argued, in particular, that there can be no scientific theory of educational leadership or educational administration. As a result, they frequently develop and support alternative theoretical perspectives for educational leadership and are often more innovative, original, and open to diverse 'ways of seeing' leadership than their American counterparts.

In Canada, for example, scholars have presented some radically different theoretical perspectives on educational leadership. Greenfield (1984) argues strongly for the use of a phenomenological lens on leadership and has stirred quite a controversy by his opposition to positivistic theories. From a phenomenological perspective, leadership exists in people's subjective interpretations of experience and constructions of reality; it is an internal phenomenon, and, as such, it is closely associated with values, beliefs, morals, meanings, and even illusions. Hodgkinson claims that leadership is a humane and

moral art whose core problems are philosophical, "valuational," and subjective rather than scientific; "values, morals, and ethics," he says, "are the very stuff of leadership ..., yet we have no comprehensive theory about them" (1991 Preface). Besides suggesting that educational leadership research should make use of a broad "value theory," he argues that there is no dichotomy between theory and practice and that educational leaders must exercise a praxis ("purposeful human conduct" or "conscious reflective intentional action," 1991 p. 113) which links theory and practice as well as theory and values.

In Australia, too, scholars have explored different theoretical perspectives on educational leadership. Bates has offered strong criticism of traditional scientific theories, proposing instead a variant of critical theory which suggests that the usually accepted notions of leadership reinforce patterns of inequality in the wider society and which calls for "the democratization of social relations" (1983 p. 39). Gronn (1987) borrows from symbolic interaction theory and psychoanalytic theory in focusing upon the psycho-social dynamics of leading and following in three different school settings. Foster (1986) [He hails from the United States, but the book was issued for the "Educational Leadership in Schools" course at Deakin University in Victoria] uses a phenomenological theoretical perspective while also emphasizing the importance of language and meaning, reflection, moral issues, and praxis ("recognition that theory must eventually be located in 'sensuous human activity,'" p. 18) in his attempt to reconstruct

leadership. Both Deakin and Monash Universities have made attempts to introduce theoretical perspectives from phenomenology and critical theory to educational leadership research, training, and practice in Australia.

In Israel, recent research conducted at Hebrew University, which offers the country's only graduate level educational leadership program, has focused on theory development in educational leadership. Inbar (1980), seeking to broaden the way the school principal's role is conceived, has developed a framework that includes a success-failure continuum and associated role-climates; he suggests that this framework "can be perceived as a new theoretical viewpoint" for explaining, analyzing, and predicting leader behavior (p. 243). Similarly, in Lebanon, Sara's comparative study of educational leaders in four developing countries -- Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan -- suggests the possibility of new theory development for educational leadership research and, in fact, of "a universal theory of leadership" that would be valid across nations and cultures (1981 p. 30).

4. Research

Parallel to the discussion of theory above, three concerns are addressed here: general considerations in educational leadership research; research on leadership in the educational administration literature from 1980 to 1991; and international perspectives on, and use of, educational leadership research since 1980.

4.1 General Considerations

The research on leadership in educational administration has become noticeably broader and more open to new kinds and sources of data, different data gathering techniques, innovative methods, combinations of different designs, and divers analytical procedures. At the same time, it still suffers from several faults and limitations, many of which are emphasized repeatedly by scholars who conduct surveys of the literature. Some comments -- first about faults/limitations and then about positive directions -- bear note:

(a) Faults/limitations: (1) The research all too often exhibits vague ideas about leadership and does not focus on the specific circumstances of educational leaders or attempt to explore new territory (see Immegart 1988). (2) Studies are too frequently characterized by survey designs, overused questionnaires, data gathered after the fact, a traits/attributes approach to leadership, simple descriptive or correlational procedures involving limited variables, raw empiricism, haphazard linking of variables, limited constructs to guide inquiry, convenience samples, instrument-dictated designs, a compulsion to examine regularities rather than variations, overreliance on cross-sectional analysis, lack of attention to antecedent and consequent variables, overreliance on the reputation of previous research, and a general failure to account for possible alternative explanations, to include extra-organizational variables, to examine the interaction of variables, to correctly

specify the unit of analysis, to mention the response rate to surveys, and to fully consider issues of reliability and validity (see Immegart 1988, Bridges 1982). (3) There is little effort to synthesize and critically evaluate findings across the domain or across a group of studies in the domain, nor is there much attempt to build upon the results of other studies (Crehan 1985, Morris 1985, Walker 1989, Immegart 1988). Many scholars attribute this to the increasingly specialized and heterogeneous nature of research on educational leadership and within the broad field of educational administration. (4) The practical problems of school leaders are seldom addressed (Bridges 1982), such that practitioners often find the research irrelevant or obfuscating. (5) The research focuses almostly exclusively on public school leaders, thereby neglecting the potentially different model of leadership within the private sector and the potential variation among private school leaders (see Bridges 1982). (6) Much of the research continues to invoke the effective schools literature, despite the by-now-acknowledged weaknesses of that literature, or the organizational effectiveness literature, despite the potential differences between general organizational settings and school settings.

[illegible] qualitative and quantitative methods. Of the 36 empirical studies previously noted, 12 (33%) use qualitative methods, 18 (50%) use

quantitative methods, and 6 (17%) combine qualitative and quantitative methods. Clearly, the often-expressed complaint about overreliance on quantitative methods in educational leadership research is no longer accurate. (2) There is a sincere desire by some scholars to open educational leadership research to questions about morality/ethics, values, norms/beliefs, culture, meaning, metaphor, and art. Some argue that leadership is an art rather than, or in addition to, a science, and that any consideration of leadership should include the humanities and the arts as well as the social sciences (Hodgkinson 1991, Greenfield 1984, Duke 1986). Thus, there are efforts to broaden the scope of educational leadership research and to introduce hitherto neglected approaches. Also, researchers now come to educational leadership research from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds, adding vitality and diversity to the domain. (3) Some scholars now focus on actual leadership situations and on the practice and problems of leadership in education, as well as on <u>praxis</u> as a bridging of theory and practice. (4) Some research now includes extra-organizational or environmental variables -- i.e., external rules and mandates, district policies, financial constraints, broad cultural attitudes or norms. (5) Some researchers now look at leadership as a phenomenon that includes teachers, students, and other constituencies, and, as a result, data sources, data gathering techniques, and research variables have expanded widely. Also, recent efforts to 'democratize' schools, to empower teachers, and to institute school-based management and participatory decision making have affected the way leadership is

conceived and then studied in education. (6) Much of the recent educational leadership research has focused on leadership of the 'core technology,' despite repeated findings that school leaders spend most of their time in other activities. The research thus points up the gap between what educational leaders do and what many scholars and practitioners think they should do.

3.2 Recent Studies: 1980-1991

Of the 36 empirical studies previously noted, 19 (53%) focus on the school principal as leader, while 6 (17%) focus on the superintendent as leader. Others studies look at the leadership of the deputy head, the faculty head, elementary school teachers, the district, both the elementary school principal and the superintendent, principals in general (no level is specified) and the superintendent, the principal and deputy principal, and the head of school (higher education). Only two studies have no focus on specific leadership positions in schools. Of the 19 studies of the principal, 7 treat principals in general, while 6 treat secondary school principals, 5 elementary school principals, and 1 a junior-high school principal. Of the 28 non-empirical articles on educational leadership in the periodical literature surveyed, 20 (71%) have no concrete focus on a leadership position, while the other 8 consider principals, principals together with others, or the deputy principal.

The list of 967 "leadership" items in Education Index, 1980-1991, includes 357 that name a specific position. Of those 357, 146 (41%) include the principal (most do not specify level), while 35 include teachers, 18 superintendents, and 10 department

chairs. Other positions named are special education personnel, boards/trustees, counselors, and states/governors. AERA annual meeting sessions, papers, and presentations on leadership, 1980-1991, include 51 references to the principal, 22 to teachers, and 13 to superintendents.

The principal, then, is the primary focus of both the empirical and non-empirical literature on educational leadership, with the superintendent a distant second and various other positions well down from those two. Teachers receive little attention in the empirical research but have emerged as a major focus of concern in the non-empirical literature and at professional meetings.

The 36 empirical studies exhibit a remarkably heterogeneous array of approaches to research on educational leadership:

(a) Design: 16 are surveys (44%), 10 are case studies (28%), 5 combine survey and case study designs (14%), and 5 are descriptions of documents/test scores (14%). Thus, though the use of survey design alone is still popular, other designs have emerged in much of the research.

(b) Data Collection: 13 questionnaires only (36%); 5 documents only (14%); 3 interviews only; 1 observations only; 3 questionnaires and interviews; 3 questionnaires and documents; 2 observations and interviews; 1 observations and documents; 1 interviews and documents; 1 questionnaires, interviews, and observations; 2 observations, documents, and interviews; and 1 questionnaires, observations, documents, and interviews.

Though questionnaires remain the predominant means of collecting data, several different strategies and combinations of strategies are used as well. Moreover, the questionnaire strategy is often complex, with some studies administering questionnaires to multiple constituencies and others employing several different questionnaires in a single study. Documents include diaries, journals, school/district/state data, and photographs; interviews are structured, unstructured, or both; and observations include active participation, non-participation, shadowing, and even self-observation.

(c) Variables: Leadership is used as a dependent variable in some studies and an independent variable in others. Though few studies attempt a strictly causal analysis, a host of variables are loosely used as antecedents to, or consequents from, leadership, or as factors correlated with leadership. The following is a classification of some of the variables according to the position or level to which they are directly related in the studies. (1) Principal: various dimensions of instructional leadership, activities, use of time, skills, knowledge, satisfaction, self-assessment, power and authority, decision making, correspondence, contacts, problems, worklocation, mail flow, work purpose,

initiating structure and consideration, values, recognizing incongruence, recognizing leadership validation and attribution, sex, lay vs. religious, experience, preparation, socialization. (2) Superintendent: salary, training, years in position, ethnic origin, mobile vs. non-mobile, all 12 LBDQ scales, setting goals, selecting staff, supervising and evaluating staff, establishing an instructional focus, ensuring consistency in the 'technical core,' monitoring curriculum and instruction, managing the instructional program, promoting a learning climate, defining the mission, skills, knowledge, source of satisfaction, responsibilities. (3) Teachers/Staff: Attitudes, decision making, in-service opportunities, influences on their role as leaders, zone of acceptance, sex, dogmatism, interpersonal trust, orientation towards the union. (4) School: climate, governance, complexity, support services, school councils, teaching personnel, student achievement, teacher-oriented vs. management-oriented contracts, the school itself. (5) Environment: district policies, district curricular objectives, district control and

coordination of the 'technical core,' year, community context, the district itself.

(d) Methods of Analysis: Approximately one-third of the studies use more than one method to analyze data, though almost all use a single predominant method. These predominant methods include: (1) description of, or broad descriptive classifications of, the aggregated data (11 studies, or 31% of the 36 studies); (2) multiple regression analysis (4 studies); (3) use of Mintzberg's (1973) categories for structured observation or a variant of this (4 studies); (4) comparative content analysis (3 studies); (5) correlation analysis (2 studies); (6) analysis of the components of variance (1 study); (7) analysis of variance (1 study); (8) meta-analysis (1 study); (9) discriminant analysis (1 study); (10) chi-square analysis (1 study); (11) ethogeny [that is, discovering the meaning of individuals' accounts] (1 study); (12) triangulation of several sources of qualitative data into categories (1 study); (13) instrument construction, from gathering a pool of questions to assessing reliability and validity (1 study); (14) phenomenological data reduction of self-observations (1 study); (15) complex qualitative analysis -- use of memos, summary sheets, coding, clustering, etc. (1 study); (16) regression and structural equation modeling (1 study). In short, researchers are using a variety of methods in studies of educational leadership.

(e) Outcomes: Research outcomes, noted by the two most frequently studied school leadership positions -- their work, antecedents and consequents of their leadership, and the effects of their leadership -- and then in general terms, include the following: The Principal: (1) The principal's work is characterized by high volume, unrelenting pace, variety, brevity, fragmentation, frequent interruptions, unpredictability, frustration, and ambiguity. Though the principal's role is still defined in terms of how men carry it out, there are non-male ways of being a successful principal. Principals often see their leadership practice significantly differently from the way teachers perceive it. The principal's instructional leadership is associated with school achievement; with the socioeconomic status of the school; with instructional organization and school climate, which in turn affect student achievement; and with the instructional performance of the school. (2) The antecedents of principals' leadership, though rarely treated thoroughly and usually discussed in terms of correlated rather than causal factors, include personal, organizational, and environmental variables. Principles' personalities can influence their work because principals can choose the content of that work. Furthermore, personal, task-related, and consideration-related factors are all associated with a principal's leadership. Organizational factors are the most significant

constraints on principals' leadership, while environmental constraints exert only a minor influence. Nevertheless, as leaders, principals must look both within the school and outside the school. Today, the movement toward decentralization may lead to the erosion of the principal's power and compel the principal to spend more time in the external environment. (3) The effects of the principal's leadership are frequently examined, particularly in relation to student achievement, instruction, and curriculum. Clearly, the principal's instructional leadership can affect those areas; remarkably, however, principals spend little of their time on instructional leadership. In addition, the principal's effectiveness as a leader tends to be linked with a task orientation rather than with a relationship orientation, and a task orientation appears to be especially salient in schools that have an unfavorable atmosphere. Similarly, the principal's initiating structure behavior is more strongly related to teachers' professional 'zone of acceptance' of their leadership than is the principal's consideration behavior, though principals high in both kinds of behavior are associated with the widest professional 'zone of acceptance.' Female elementary teachers seem to have a wider 'zone of acceptance' of principal leadership behavior than male elementary teachers do. Also, principals' behavior, values, beliefs, attitudes, goals, and skills all appear

to affect school life; ineffective principal leadership contributes to negative shifts in the social structure and culture of the school; leadership attributions can influence a principal, and this influence in turn can affect the school; and the behavior of the principal to teachers may produce a mirror effect in the behavior of teachers to students. The Superintendent: (1) Superintendents' work is characterized by abruptness, discontinuity, and superficiality. One study indicates that superintendents appear to be managers more than they are leaders because over 70% of their contacts are with administrators and policy makers rather than with principals and teachers; another suggests, however, that they may steer their districts in directions of their own choosing and also influence shared meanings. Career-bound superintendents tolerate uncertainty better than place-bound superintendents, but place-bound superintendents are more effective at initiating organizational structure. (2) Superintendents' leadership is constrained by organizational and social factors; such factors largely determine the issues they attend to and the people with whom they interact. Still, they are able to maneuver within these constraints and to translate societal structures and preferences into policies and practices. They exercise leadership by influencing information flows and school system operation and governance and by serving as a symbol. (3) Despite the

constraints that operate on them, superintendents do appear to exert some influence on the academic performance of their school districts and on the instructional leadership of principals. In effective school districts they actively manage 'technical core' activities through a variety of direct and indirect leadership tools, ensuring that their districts are tightly rather than loosely coupled in the areas of curriculum and instruction. General: Outcomes across the studies suggest several generalizations -- (1) educational leadership is affected by personal, organizational, and environmental factors; (2) educational leaders do affect school performance; (3) educational leaders spend much of their time on activities often considered more management-oriented than leadership-oriented; (4) educational leadership should be considered in terms of the meanings, symbols, and values of specific contexts as well as in terms of behavior, traits, and styles; (5) decentralization, democratization, and other reforms symbolically change educational leadership and also affect leader behavior; (6) educational leadership should be studied with both qualitative and quantitative methods; (7) the predominant concern in the educational leadership research is the instructional leadership of the principal.

4.3 International Perspectives

Educational leadership has been a focus of research by scholars in many countries, including the United States, Australia, Canada, and Israel. While most of the research from those countries has looked at leadership only within the home country of the researcher(s), some research has attempted to compare leadership in two or more countries or to speculate on how findings might be relevant to, or might inform, leadership contexts in other countries. Furthermore, some researchers from different countries have collaborated on studies that treat one or more of their native countries. Murphy (1988) has argued that international research on educational leadership can reveal options that have not been considered heretofore, provide "natural experiments" for individual countries to examine, demonstrate that many approaches to leadership can be successful, and underline the importance of context to educational leadership.

In Canada, both Hodgkinson (1991) and Greenfield (1984) have argued for the relevance of feelings, beliefs, values, moral issues, and <u>real, lived</u> experience in research on educational leadership. Greenfield insists that leadership research must focus on the invention of social realities and calls for a new science which "will require methods and instruments that are adequate to these [subjective] realities" (1988 p. 151). Hodgkinson (1991) suggests the use of "maxims" that lie between guesswork and empirical assertions in educational leadership research. Leithwood et al. (1992) use their research on the behavior and thinking of school leaders and a focus on real

problems in real schools to present what they call "expert school leadership" for future schools. The only Canadian empirical study of educational leadership within the 36 periodical articles already noted is by Crehan (1985), who concludes, after analyzing educational leadership dissertations between 1983 and 1984, that meta-analysis may not be a productive way to assess the educational leadership knowledge base.

In Australia, the development of alternatives to government schooling, the restructuring of state systems, and the changes introduced as a result of decentralization and devolution of authority have presented challenges to educational leadership researchers (see Chapman and Boyd 1986), as have the new theoretical perspectives introduced by Bates (1983), Gronn (1987), and others. The new governance structures and alternative theoretical perspectives have encouraged the search for new study designs, new data gathering techniques, and new analytical methods. Gronn's case studies of school leaders, for example, proceed through "administrator watching," a strategy of "systematically monitoring and reflecting upon self over and against the experience of the other" (1987 p. 3); they place text and reader in a relationship that parallels the relationship between leader and follower.

There are six empirical studies by Australian scholars of the 36 empirical articles surveyed, and together they exhibit a variety of data gathering techniques (interviews, observations, diaries, questionnaires) and analytical methods (constant comparison, coding, correlation, ethogeny). Outcomes include the

following: both superintendents' and principals' work is fragmentary and discontinuous; decentralization decreases a principal's power; democratic leadership is associated with positive staff morale; women educational leaders exhibit several different ways of leading; and leadership is best explained by a theory of exchange, not by traits or behavior.

In Israel, Inbar's research has looked at the interrelationships between educational responsibility and success-failure, role climates, and educational leadership. He argues that "since school principalship includes activation of teachers, who are themselves caught in a relatively 'apathetic' role climate, educational leadership becomes a major challenge" (1980 p. 243). Other researchers have studied the risk initiation of leaders in autonomous schools, as well as the relationships between biographical data and personal value orientations, one one hand, and the performance effectiveness of elementary school principals, on the other.

The 36 empirical studies surveyed include two by Israeli scholars. Sara (1980) administered the LBDQ to secondary school principals (n=99) in Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan, and concluded that there is a general pattern of leadership common to all four countries. Avi-Itzhak and Ben-Peretz (1989), investigating factors that affect principals' roles as change facilitators in the area of curriculum, administered a questionnaire to principals (n=69) in a large Israeli city and then, after a multiple regression analysis, obtained the following results: the instructional leadership role of the

principal is very important; effective principals are oriented toward people; personal and organizational factors are more important than policy and strategy factors in affecting principals' facilitation of curricular change; and state ownership of schools (as opposed to non-state ownership) is positively related to several leadership styles.

5. Emergent Trends

Several trends have emerged in the literature since 1980:

(a) Educational leadership is now often considered a shared, group, or collective phenomenon, even when individual positions are the focus of study.

(b) Recent reforms -- school-based management, choice, participatory decision making, empowerment, decentralization -- have affected the way educational leadership is conceived, studied, and practiced.

(c) Researchers now frequently consider educational leadership an art involving values, culture, ethics, interpretation, metaphors, symbols, meaning, and moral imagination as much as they consider it a science of behavior, and they often call for theory and research which draws from the humanities as much as it does from the social sciences.

(d) Despite complaints about the faults and limitations of the research, it has become more complex and multidimensional and more open to the reciprocal effects of leaders and followers, different disciplinary

perspectives, both qualitative and quantitative methods, and the use of environmental variables.

(e) Though many scholars admit that the gulf is still wide, many are eager to bridge theory/research and practice.

(f) There is a sincere desire to explore some largely uncharted territory -- women and educational leadership, substitutes for leadership, cross-national leadership perspectives and practices, racial and ethnic issues in leadership, leadership and emerging technologies, leadership by and for the disadvantaged, and the use of various qualitative methods and combinations of methods.

(g) There is a growing concern about leadership effects/outcomes.

(h) Female researchers are now contributing substantially to educational leadership research (Of the 64 articles surveyed in the periodical literature, 20 were written by women or by teams of men and women, and of the 36 empirical studies within that group of 64, 14 were by women or teams of men and women).

(i) The research is becoming as much concerned with rich studies of specific practices as it is with more generalizable studies.

(j) There is a persistent call now for educational leadership training that emphasizes actual problems and practices.

(k) There is an increasing interest in leadership in non-traditional programs such as accelerated schools and alternative schools.

(1) Though the principal and the superintendent remain the primary focus of that research which treats positional leaders, there is an increasing interest in multiple sources of educational leadership -- administrators, teachers, students, parents, etc.

6. Possible Directions for Future Research

Directions for future research might include: (a) longitudinal studies that look at leadership over time and even over the life course; (b) systematic efforts to synthesize the disparate elements of the domain and to develop comprehensive, inclusive perspectives which, at the same time, differentiate between educational leadership, management, and administration or at least define their interrelationships; (c) further studies of leadership using as-yet-univestigated perspectives from the humanities or the 'human sciences' -- literary theory, textual analysis, rhetorical theory, deconstruction, semiology; (d) studies of leaders in private sector schools and in educational settings that may exhibit leadership variation; (e) improved efforts to integrate qualitative and quantitative methods and to make use of several methods in a single study; (f) additional comparative research on educational leadership in different countries, in different types of schools, and in different positions or at different levels of a school system; (g) renewed efforts to focus on real leaders in real settings and to develop training programs that will help potential leaders engage in the practical problems they will encounter on the job; (h) more emphasis on diverse followers and interest groups and leaders'

understandings of them; (i) increased efforts to study how educational reforms and policies -- as well as broad changes in social attitudes and institutions, demography, and family structure -- affect educational leaders and leadership; (j) more research by practicing educational leaders using self-observation, self-reflection, and other strategies; (k) a focus upon educational leadership in various non-school and non-district contexts -- i.e., the union, the state, professional associations, publishers, foundations, testing agencies; (l) additional research on how different environments affect leadership and, in particular, how a market environment may affect leaders differently from an institutional environment; (m) a serious attempt to help educational leaders understand how they can devote more attention to curriculum, instruction, and student learning or how they can empower others to assume leadership in those areas; (n) increased attention to how everyone in a school can be empowered to assume leadership responsibilities.

Some scholars argue that the domain of educational leadership research is in total disarray and that it has stagnated. On the contrary, however, the domain seems to be a vital and expanding area that will certainly continue to receive attention in the future. Obviously there is much for researchers to investigate, especially if, as Murphy claims, "Leaders and leadership in the postindustrial age must look radically different from what they have looked like in the past" (1992 p. 124).

References

Bass BM 1990 Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications. Free Press, New York

Bates RJ 1983 Educational Administration and the Management of Knowledge. Deakin University Press, Victoria

Boyan NJ 1988 Describing and Explaining Administrator Behavior. In: Boyan NJ (ed.) 1988 Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. Longman, New York

Bridges EM 1992 Problem Based Learning for Administrators. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene, Oregon

Bridges EM 1982 Research on the School Administrator: The State of the Art, 1967-1980. Educational Administration Quarterly. 18(3):12-33

Bridges EM 1977 The Nature of Leadership. In: Cunningham LL, Hack WG, Nystrand RO (eds.) 1977 Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, California

Burns JM 1978 Leadership. Harper and Row, New York

Chapman J, Boyd WL 1986 Decentralization, Devolution, and the School Principal: Australian Lessons on Statewide Educational Reform. Educational Administration Quarterly. 22(4):28-58

Clark DL, Lotto LS, Astuto TA 1984 Effective Schools and School Improvement: A Comparative Analysis of Two Lines of Inquiry. Educational Administration Quarterly. 20(3):41-68

Crehan P 1985 An Exploration of the Usefulness of Meta-Analysis in Educational Administration. Educational Administration Quarterly. 21(3):263-279

Duke DL 1986 The Aesthetics of Leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly. 22(1):7-27

Foster W 1986 The Reconstruction of Leadership. Deakin University Press, Victoria

Greenfield TB 1988 The Decline and Fall of Science in Educational Administration. In: Griffiths DE, Stout RT, Forsyth PB (eds.) 1988 Leaders for America's Schools. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, California

Greenfield TB 1984 Leaders and Schools: Wilfulness and Nonnatural Order in Organizations. In: Sergiovanni TJ, Corbally JE (eds.) Leadership and Organizational Culture. University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

Greenfield WD, Marshall C, Reed DB 1986 Experience in the Vice Principalship: Preparation for Leading Schools? Journal of Educational Administration. 24(1): 107-121

Gronn P (ed.) 1986 The Psycho-Social Dynamics of Leading and Following. Deakin University Press, Victoria

Halpin AW 1966 Theory and Research in Administration. Macmillan, New York

Hodgkinson C 1991 Educational Leadership: The Moral Art. State University of New York Press, Albany, New York

Hodgkinson C 1981 A New Taxonomy of Administrative Process. Journal of Educational Administration. 19(2): 141-152

Immegart GL 1988 Leadership and Leader Behavior. In: Boyan NJ (ed.) 1988 Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. Longman, New York

Inbar DE 1980 Organizational Role Climates: Success-Failure Configurations in Educational Leadership. Journal of Educational Administration. 18(2): 232-244

Leithwood K, Begley PT, Cousins JB (eds.) 1992 Developing Expert Leadership for Future Schools. Falmer, New York

Mintzberg H 1973 The Nature of Managerial Work. Harper and Row, New York

Morris GB 1985 A Futuristic Cognitive View of Leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly. 21(1):7-27

Murphy J 1992 The Landscape of Leadership Preparation: Reframing the Education of School Administrators. Corwin Press, Newbury Park, California

Murphy MJ 1988 Alternatives for Educational Administration: Lessons from Abroad. In: Griffiths DE, Stout RT, Forsyth PB (eds.) 1988 Leaders for America's Schools. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, California

Norton MS 1988 A National Survey of Departmental Organization in Educational Administration. In: Griffiths DE, Stout RT, Forsyth PB (eds.) 1988 Leaders for America's Schools. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, California

Norton MS, Levan FD 1988 Doctoral Studies of Students in Educational Administration Programs in UCEA-Member Institutions. In: Griffiths DE, Stout RT, Forsyth PB (eds.) 1988 Leaders for America's Schools. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, California

Pfeffer J 1978 The Ambiguity of Leadership. In: McCall MW, Lombardo MM (eds.) 1978 Leadership: Where Else Can We Go? Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina

Rost JC 1991 Leadership for the Twenty-First Century. Praeger, New York

Sara NG 1981 A Comparative Study of Leader Behavior of School Principals in Four Developing Countries. Journal of Educational Administration. 19(1):21-32

Sergiovanni TJ 1992 Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

Smith JK, Blase J 1991 From Empiricism to Hermeneutics: Educational Leadership as a Practical and Moral Activity. Journal of Educational Administration. 29(1):6-21

Walker WG 1989 Leadership in an Age of Ambiguity and Risk. Journal of Educational Administration. 27(1): 7-18

Suggested Further Reading

Baptiste HP, Waxman HC, de Felix JW, Anderson JE 1990 Leadership, Equity, and School Effectiveness. Sage, Newbury Park, California

Biklen SK 1980 Women and Educational Leadership. DC Heath, Lexington, Massachusetts

Burdin, JL (ed.) 1989 School Leadership. Sage, Newbury Park, California

Cuban L 1988 The Managerial Imperative and the Practice of Leadership in Schools. State University of New York Press, Albany, New York

Cunningham LL, Mitchell B (eds.) 1990 Educational Leadership and Changing Contexts of Families, Communities, and Schools. University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Duke BC 1991 Education and Leadership for the Twenty-First Century: Japan, America, and Britain. Praeger, New York

Jacobson SL, Conway JA (eds.) 1990 Educational Leadership in an Age of Reform. Longman, New York

Lomotey K 1989 African-American Principals: School Leadership and Success. Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut

Popper, SH 1990 Pathways to the Humanities in School Administration. University Council for Educational Administration, Tempe, Arizona

Smith SC, Piele PK 1989 School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene, Oregon

Smyth J. (ed.) 1989 Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership. Falmer, Philadelphia

Watkins P 1986 A Critical Review of Leadership Concepts and Research: The Implications for Educational Administration. Deakin University Press, Victoria